## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

John Arthur Bonner,

Plaintiff

v.

Jerry Howell, et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01918-JAD-VCF

**Order Dismissing Action** 

Plaintiff John Arthur Bonner brings a claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at Three Lakes Valley Conservation Camp.<sup>1</sup> On February 26, 2021, the magistrate judge directed Bonner to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within 30 days.<sup>2</sup> The magistrate judge expressly warned him that if he failed to timely comply with the order this case would be subject to dismissal without prejudice.<sup>3</sup> The deadline has passed, and Bonner has not filed a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and "[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal" of a case.<sup>4</sup> A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>5</sup> In determining whether to

1 ....

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> ECF No. 1-1 (complaint).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ECF No. 8 (order).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–

dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. 

I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this cases. 

The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury

litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case. The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement. Bonner was warned that his case could be subject to dismissal without prejudice if he failed to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within 30 days. So, Bonner had adequate warning that his failure to file a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* would result in this case's dismissal.

17 | | ///

18 | | ///

19 | | ///

<sup>41 (9</sup>th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Thompson, 782 F.2d at 831; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; Malone, 833 F.2d at 130; Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262; Malone, 833 F.2d at 132–33; Henderson, 779 F.2d at 1424.

<sup>9</sup> ECF No. 8 (order).

## 

| 1  | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without                    |
|----|--|
| 2  | prejudice based on Bonner's failure to file a non-prisoner application to proceed in forma |
| 3  | pauperis in compliance with this court's February 26, 2021, order; and                     |
| 4  | The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS                |
| 5  | CASE.  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  | Dated: April 7, 2021   |
| 8  | U.S. District Lucy James A. Dorsov   |
| 9  | U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey   |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 | 2  |